



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We are either, many of us, magicians, vehicles of incalculable forces, airy demonstrators of the penetrability of matter, blithe trippers into fourth-dimensional space, mothers of magically born beings who are made of our very substance and who return to remerge themselves into that substance;—we are all this, or we are in practically constant communication with a world of discarnate intelligences. Yet few of us appear to care profoundly what the truth of it may be. Most of us are content to leave the whole matter in the hands of a small society of investigators. It is true that affiliation with the unseen is not the attribute of every temperament; but everybody can learn to accept the fact,—sufficiently established in this single book of Mr. Garland's,—that the human body is the lodging-place of miracles.

What we call “popular science” is peculiarly congenial to the American mind. Would Americans regard psychic matters with greater respect if they should become able to dissociate them from spiritualism, to class them as science rather than as religion? Would the astonishing facts that Mr. Garland has done a genuine service in simply setting forth then come to seem approximately as important as a surgical operation or a machine for multiplying the horrors of war?

OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR.

“SCIENCE AND IMMORTALITY.”*

ALTHOUGH the belief in immortality rests essentially upon certain broad rational grounds, familiar and open to all, the author of the present volume pleads for the worth of the contributory evidence, offered by scientific investigation, in support of continued personal existence after death. His general position is that set forth in Myers's monumental work on “Human Personality.” That is, there lies not only beyond the subliminal activities of any given patient, but also beyond any possible explanation of telepathy, a considerable body of psychic phenomena, carefully sifted by thorough scientific methods, which can be accounted for alone on the supposition of veritable messages from discarnate intelligences.

That such phenomena are meagre, or for the most part trivial,

* “Science and Immortality.” By Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S. New York: Moffat, Yard & Company.

in no way diminishes their evidential value; but they should be strictly guarded from the abuse of charlatans or of shallow and enthusiastic supporters who always bring any cause they advocate into discredit, and should be restricted to the painstaking investigations of science.

The problem of immortality, however, occupies but one of the four sections that constitute Sir Oliver's richly suggestive volume. His deepest concern seems to be, as a steward of the mysteries of physical science, to help "to prepare the way, in some slight degree, for the Coming of the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth," by showing the consistency of science and faith in general, but more especially the consistency of science and Christianity, the fundamental doctrines of which, "embodying the most vital truths known to mankind, can be interpreted and assimilated by advanced thought." Involved in the accomplishment of this purpose there is a discussion of Corporate Worship and Service in which are found valuable suggestions toward increasing the efficiency of the National Church, by harmonizing its various parts into a closer union, and by adjusting it more completely to modern conditions.

Our author begins by squarely confronting orthodox science, as represented by the average Fellow of the Royal Society, with orthodox faith, as represented by the average Christian theologian. These two present two quite distinct conceptions of the universe. The conception of science is

"that of a self-contained and self-sufficient universe, with no outlook into or links with anything beyond, uninfluenced by any life or mind except such as is connected with a visible and tangible material body"; while the conception of faith is

"that of a universe lying open to all manner of spiritual influences, permeated through and through with a Divine Spirit, guided and watched by living minds, acting through the mechanism of law, indeed, but with intelligence and love behind the law; a universe by no means self-sufficient or self-contained, but with sensitive tendrils groping into another supersensitive order of existence, where reign laws hitherto unrecognized by science, but laws as real and as mighty as those by which the natural universe is governed."

The opposition between these two views really turns upon the efficacy of prayer and all it implies of helpful influences from a realm higher than the visible world, and of a continued exist-

ence in that higher world beyond death. We have already seen what Sir Oliver says concerning the possibility of a future life; what is to be said concerning the possible interrelation between the scientific material and the religious spiritual worlds?

The most fundamental teaching of science is found in her doctrine of Natural Law, expressing the Uniformity of Nature, considered either as a static *relation among* things or as an evolving, dynamic *progress of* things. On first view, this would seem to present a system of inescapable necessity which entirely crushes out rational freedom and the ideal values of religion altogether, renders prayer meaningless, and the old friendly interference of supernatural help absurd.

But on further view, it comes to be seen that in reality the essential significance of religion is greatly enhanced by the scientific conception of Law and Uniformity, for it represents the Power back of the universe, upon which religion depends, as immanent in the universe, forever answering prayer and working a perpetual miracle. Only prayer must now no longer be taken as a means to secure the gratification of mere personal whims, but rather as an intelligent striving of the human toward the divine; nor must miracle any longer be taken as an intermittent *infringement of* the natural order, but recognized rather as the wonder of a permanent and uniform *control over* the natural order.

It is the nature of this overlying control or guidance that lifts us above slavish subjection to a mere mechanical necessity into a realm of free intelligence and rational mind. For a system of things which first reveals above its necessary, mechanical interrelations, the intelligent control of life, and then, above life, the creative activities of human thought and will, must have, as its ground, a Divine Reason infinitely above that of man and immanent as a guiding principle throughout the universe.

It is in the light of this rational control that science and religion find a common ground. All is uniformity, law, changeless order, which it is the business of science to investigate and understand; while at the same time the need of religion is supplied in a friendly Power, akin to man, forever working on his behalf.

"Miracles lie all around us; only they are not miraculous [in the old sense of exceptional, arbitrary interference]; special providences

envelop us; only they are not special [in the sense of favoring personal privilege]; and prayer is a means of communication as natural and simple as is speech [in the sense of winning power and mastery by understanding and obedience]."

This transformation, in our thought, of the world, by which it becomes one great system of law and order, pervaded throughout and controlled by immanent Divine Intelligence, necessitates a transformation, in our thought, of Christian doctrine, a transformation which indeed many enlightened theologians desire or seek to effect. With some hesitation and yet under the sense of an obligation to utter the best in him, Sir Oliver undertakes to suggest various changes in our interpretation of Christianity which our scientific view of the world most pressingly demands. Thus, with our larger conception of the miraculous, not as an arbitrary *interference* in the course of nature, but as a pervasive intelligent *control* over the course of nature, the supernormal birth of Jesus or His physical ascent into Heaven have no meaning. The one-sided, human origin of Jesus in no way increases his capacity to reveal God to us, but rather decreases it; for not only does it cast discredit upon the *entirety* of God's immanence in nature, but makes it futile for earth-born men to try to follow, as they are urged, the example of Christ. So far as the Ascension is concerned, its only significance can be that of an advance to higher planes of spiritual consciousness; as an ascent to regions of space above the blue, it can have no meaning whatever to our modern thought.

The doctrines of divine wrath and of sin can no longer be held in the old way. Sin is a reversion to a lower type, and divine wrath may be regarded as expressing the painful result of wrong-doing. The only sense in which the divine wrath can be understood is that in which it displayed itself in the bitter denunciation of Jesus against the presumptuous superiority of self-asserted goodness. In its literal sense, it can have no meaning as God's displeasure with the vast majority of men, struggling along amid the narrow limitations of their ignorance and weakness, and who need pity and help rather than wrath and punishment.

In like manner the deep truth underlying the Atonement must have restatement. We can no longer think of a substituted penalty in terms of the old Roman code. The atonement of

Jesus was not a bloody sacrifice to appease the wrath of a jealous God against sin, but the sacrifice of love, stooping to endure the contradictions of sin, and, thus overcoming them, to show man the way to his own divine self-realization as a son of God.

In view of such considerations, we must form our views of the nature of Christ and his work. Aside from all ecclesiastical and dogmatic accretions, the essential constituents of Christianity are spiritual and practical—the worship of God as a Spirit and the service of man as a brother. But these elements in themselves do not sharply enough distinguish Christianity from other great religious creeds, and we must seek a still more fundamental substratum upon which its detailed words and teachings rest. And this ultimate ground-element of Christianity, Sir Oliver believes, he finds in “the conception of a human God; of a God, not apart from the universe, not outside it and distinct from it, but immanent in it; yet not immanent only, but actually incarnate as revealed in the Incarnation.” In a very broad sense, the nature of God is revealed in everything, but most clearly and fully in the highest type of man as seen in Christ. According to the Hegelian phrase, God comes to consciousness in man; and this conception “welds together Christianity and Pantheism, and Paganism and Philosophy.” It adds to the humanity of Christ, which is unique only by reason of its spiritual altitude, the divinity of Christ which gives value and meaning to His humanity, and which, however exceptional, is yet within the reach of humanity. “Ye are the sons of God.”

Bewildering as this thought may be, it is a truth dimly and partially seen by all the prophets, and doubtless by many of the pagan saints, but more especially is it the revelation of Christ Himself. That God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself is the hope of humanity, for it brings God very near to men “in their midst and of their fellowship, sympathizing with their struggles, rejoicing in their successes, and evoking, even in their own poor nature, some dim and broken image of Himself.”

The value of Sir Oliver's admirable volume, which has grown out of previous articles in the “Hibbert Journal” and the “Contemporary Review,” does not lie in any striking originality of thought, but in the fact of its existence as a rational mediation between science and religion. The attempt to adjust tradition-

alism to any given modern culture is as old as civilization. It is always the attempt to reconcile the rationalism of science, with its subjection to the facts and laws of a necessitated order of things, and the mysticism of religion, with its individual self-determined freedom and its devotion to the higher values of the spiritual life. In our day such a reconciliation seems more nearly possible than ever before. Only a generation ago the prevailing tendency of science was to restrict itself dogmatically to its rationalism, and to shut out, as unworthy of serious consideration or as unproductive of valid results, any claims of mysticism upon which religion rests; while religious men, compelled indeed to admit the advance of scientific doctrine, met the difficulty by exhausting their ingenuity in subjecting the new ideas to their old statements. Science was inclined to claim to know too little; religion, as always, was inclined to claim to know too much.

But to-day, science and religion are, if not altogether friendly, at least on speaking terms, because science, beginning to recognize the inadequacy of mere natural knowledge to satisfy the highest interests of man, is inclined to admit a valid realm of thought and investigation beyond the domain of a strict dogmatic rationalism; while religion, beginning to recognize the inadequacy of the traditionally infallible statements of doctrine, is showing itself, not only willing, but anxious for a restatement of the old doctrines in modern terms.

We have in Sir Oliver a happy combination of both these modern tendencies. Though, strictly speaking, a scientific man, he is at the same time deeply imbued with the spirit of religion. Fully alive to the claims of scientific rationalism, he yet clearly sees its incompetence to cover the entire field of man's rational interests, just because it needs to be supplemented, and, indeed, completed, by those truths of mysticism which form the ground of religion. His general position as a mediator recalls that of Lotze, who, in the hottest of the fight between science and religion, fully appreciated both, by recognizing as the realm of science the *facts* and *laws* of a strictly necessitated mechanical order which, however, have no meaning until subordinated to those *values* which constitute the life of religion.

GERHARDT C. MARS.